Appeal: 10-7063 Doc: 8 Filed: 11/23/2010 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-7063

KEVIN ALLEN KEY,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

GENE JOHNSON, Director of the Virginia Dept. of Corrections,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Rebecca Beach Smith, District Judge. (2:09-cv-00600-RBS-TEM)

Submitted: October 7, 2010 Decided: November 23, 2010

Before NIEMEYER, MOTZ, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Kevin Allen Key, Appellant Pro Se. Craig Stallard, Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Kevin Allen Key seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) petition. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. See § 2253(c)(1) (2006). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2006). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the petition states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85. We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Key has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials

Appeal: 10-7063 Doc: 8 Filed: 11/23/2010 Pg: 3 of 3

before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED